REMARKS

The Office Action of October 27, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The present Amendment revises independent claims 8 by transferring to it two limitations that were previously recited in dependent claim 9.

The Office Action rejects all of the claims for obviousness based on US patent 5,899,810 to Smith, US patent 6,947,761 to Hutcheson et al (which will hereafter be called simply "Hutcheson" for the sake of convenient discussion), and US patent 6,557,041 to Mallart. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 recites (with emphasis added):

> 1. A method of implementing real-time video-audio interaction by data synchronization in an Internet game, comprising the steps of:
>
> establishing an Internet transmission channel between a first internet game client and a second internet game client, wherein the Internet transmission channel is not connected to an Internet game server;
>
> executing an internet game in the first Internet game client and the second internet game client and connecting the first and second Internet game clients to the internet game server;
>
> **retrieving first real-time video data and first real-time audio data in the first internet game client in the Internet game;**
>
> **compressing/encoding the first real-time video data into a plurality of first video data frames, and compressing/encoding the first real-time audio data into a plurality of first audio data packets in the first Internet game client;**
>
> packaging the first video data frames and the first audio data packets into a transmission package in the first Internet game client and attaching a time stamp to transmission package, wherein the time stamp expresses the synchronous relationship between the first real-time video and audio data;
>
> transmitting the transmission package to the second Internet game client through the Internet transmission channel;
>
> decoding the transmission package into second real-time video data and second real-time audio data in the second Internet game client; and
>
> synchronizing the second real-time video and audio data according to the time stamp, and outputting the second real-time audio and video data in the second Internet game client in the Internet game.

AMENDMENT   10/797,006

- 15 -

Argument (1): Smith does not disclose or suggest *retrieving first real-time video data and first real-time audio data in the first internet game client in the Internet game.*

On page 3, the Office Action asserts that Smith discloses retrieving first real-time video data and first real-time audio data in the first internet game client in the Internet game. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Smith, the block 107 in Fig. 4 says "game client receives new plan for E." However, the "new plan" in Smith refers to <u>adjustment of time values</u> to correspond with the local client's clock (as indicated at 109), and to <u>computing a new location for its own proxy</u> (as indicated at 110). There is nothing like the real-time video and audio data as recited in claim 1.

In addition, in Mallart, Fig. 2 discloses a client-server system 200 based on MPEG-4. However, Mallart doesn't disclose anything about "retrieving first real-time video data and first real-time audio data in the first internet game client in the Internet game" in accordance with claim 1.

Even a combination of Smith's "new plan" and Mallart's "client-server system 200" would not achieve the claimed feature of the invention.

Independent claims 8, 17, 24, 31, and 38 have similar limitations. Therefore, claims 1, 8, 17, 24, 31 and 38 should be in condition of allowance based on the reasons stated in argument (1).

Argument (2): Hutcheson does not disclose or suggest *compressing/encoding the first real-time video data into a plurality of first video data frames, and compressing/encoding the first real-time audio data into a plurality of first audio data packets in the first Internet game client.*

On page 5, the Office Action asserts that Hutcheson teaches compression of data for transfer, encoding, and decoding of Audio and Video data packets for changing the game state. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Lines 5-15 in column 11 of Hutcheson state (with emphasis added):

> The client DOF management means 246 preferably is designed to structure (encode) the change of game state information recognized by the local modeling means 244 in a manner that can be communicated to the mobile game server 300 and that efficiently utilizes the limited bandwidth of the wireless network 100. The mobile game server 300 receives the <u>coded, changed game state information</u> from each of the mobile game clients 200 in the gaming session, <u>decodes the information</u>, updates the global model, and returns the necessary information to update each mobile game client 200 relative to the global game state.

This says nothing about the Audio and Video data packet. The claimed Audio and Video data packet are simply not taught by the references.

Furthermore, lines 34-40 in column 21 of Hutcheson state (with emphasis added):

> To the extent that various actions depicted by certain degrees of freedom typically occur together, those groups of degrees of freedom may be combined into an alternative degree of freedom to further <u>compress the data transfer requirements</u>. In addition, special degrees of freedom may be created to perform unique or unusual maneuvers in the interactive application.

This merely discloses compressing the data transfer requirements. Clearly, the claimed feature *"compressing/encoding the first real-time video data into a plurality of first video data frames, and compressing/encoding the first real-time audio data into a plurality of first audio data packets"* is not taught by the references.

Independent claims 8, 17, 24 and 31 have similar limitations. This feature is not taught by references. Therefore, claims 1, 8, 17, 24 and 31 should be in condition of allowance based on the reasons stated in argument (2).

Claim 45 recites a system of implementing a real-time video-audio interaction by data synchronization in an Internet game for application to a first Internet game client, a second Internet game client, and an internet game server, wherein the Internet game server executes an Internet game, the system comprising an Internet transmission channel, the first Internet game client and the second Internet game client connecting to the Internet game server to execute the Internet game, the **Internet transmission channel coupled to the first and second Internet game clients to execute real-time video-audio interaction**, wherein the Internet transmission channel is not connected to an Internet game server.

Argument (3): Neither Smith, Hutcheson nor Mallart discloses or suggests an *Internet transmission channel coupled to the first and second Internet game clients to execute real-time video-audio interaction.*

At the bottom of page 25, the Office Action asserts that Mallart discloses the above feature. Again, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Lines 55-56 in column 8 of Mallart state: "Clients 602 and 604 now also share objects 616 and 618 with each other ...". This merely discloses the sharing the objects, rather than "an *Internet transmission channel coupled to the first and second Internet game clients to execute real-time video-audio interaction,*" in accordance with claim 45.
Therefore, claim 45 should be in condition of allowance based on the reason stated in argument (3).

The remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and recite additional limitations to further define the invention. They are therefore automatically patentable along with their independent claims . Nevertheless, several of the dependent claims will now be briefly addressed.

Claim 2, depending from claim 1, recites that the establishment of the Internet transmission channel further comprises the steps of: designating an Internet address of the

second Internet game client directly or according to a directory by the first Internet game client, wherein the directory includes the Internet address of the second Internet game client; transmitting a connection request from the first Internet game client to the second Internet game client; and establishing the Internet transmission channel by the second Internet game client in response to the connection request.

Claim 39, depending from claim 38, recites that the establishing step further comprises the steps of: designating an Internet address of the second Internet game client directly or according to a directory by the first Internet game client, wherein the directory includes the Internet address of the second Internet game client; transmitting a connection request from the first Internet game client to the second Internet game client; and establishing the Internet transmission channel by the second Internet game client in response to the connection request.

Argument (4): Smith does not disclose or suggest *designating an Internet address of the second Internet game client directly or according to a directory by the first Internet game client, wherein the directory includes the Internet address of the second Internet game client.*

On page 6, the Office Action asserts that Smith discloses the above feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Smith, Fig. 1 shows a game system comprising four game clients 21-24 accessing the internet 11 through internet service providers 14-16, wherein the definitive state of a game is tracked and coordinated by a host computer system 12. That's what was taught in Smith, and clearly, this discloses nothing relevant to the claimed feature "designating an Internet address of the second Internet game client directly or according to a directory by the first Internet game client, wherein the directory includes the Internet address of the second Internet game client."

Therefore, claim 2 and 39 should be patentable. Similarly, the feature "designating an Internet address of a third external Internet game client by the Internet game client or the

external Internet game client" of claims 18, 25 and 32 should also be patentable based on the same argument basis.

Claim 3, depending from claim 1, recites that if the bandwidth of the Internet transmission channel cannot transmit the first real-time audio data and the first real-time video data simultaneously, the first real-time audio data takes priority over first real-time video data.

Argument (5): Neither Smith Nor Hutcheson discloses or suggests *if the bandwidth of the Internet transmission channel cannot transmit the first real-time audio data and the first real-time video data simultaneously, the first real-time audio data takes priority over first real-time video data.*

On page 7, the Office Action asserts that Hutcheson discloses the above feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hutcheson, discloses a "client synchronization means 230" and a "client session management means 240." However, the reference discloses that the client synchronization means 230 is preferably a client system clock adapted to time stamp the game information that is communicated with the mobile game server 300 over the wireless communications network 100 (see col. 9, lines 46-50), and enables the state of game play to be synchronized between all users of interactive gaming system 10 (see col. 9, lines 51-53). In addition, Hutcheson discloses that the client session management means 240 manages the state, event, and behavior of the interactive game being played on the mobile game client 200 (see col. 9, lines 64-66).

Clearly, the Hutcheson reference discloses nothing relevant to the claimed feature "*if the bandwidth of the Internet transmission channel cannot transmit the first real-time audio data and the first real-time video data simultaneously, the first real-time audio data takes priority over first real-time video data.*" Therefore, claim 3 should be in condition of allowance based on the reason stated in argument (5). Similarly, claims 10, 19, 26, and 33 have the same feature, they should also be in condition of allowance based on the same argument basis.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Wood
Registration No. 28,134
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.
Customer No. 23995
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng